REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-14 and 32-44 are pending, of which claims 1, 9-14, and 32 have been amended for clarification.

Applicant's amendments and remarks after Final are appropriate under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because they address the Office's remarks in the Final Action, and thus could not have been presented earlier. In addition, the amendments and remarks should be entered to place the case in better form for appeal.

Office's Response to Arguments

In the previous response dated August 2, 2005, Applicant details that the §103 Narisi and/or Background combination does not teach or suggest "a remote data communication interface driver of the host device implemented in the client device", as recited in claim 1. In response, the Office cites to the Detailed Description in the specification at page 14, lines 8-10 and makes a comparison to the Background at page 6, lines 14-15 (*Office Action* pp. 11-12).

With reference to Fig. 5, Applicant describes that a Remote NDIS miniport driver layer (530) of a host computing device (502) is implemented in a client device (504) (instead of in the host computing device) which facilitates a point-to-point communication link (506) between the two devices without having to configure the host computing device with interface components to communicate with the client device. The host computing device can be communicatively linked with any mobile client device without having driver(s) for a particular device installed on the host computing device (*Specification* p.14, lines 8-16; Fig. 5).

lee⊗hayes   10   MSI-921US M03

PAGE 12/18 * RCVD AT 11/29/2005 5:08:31 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/31 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:15093238979 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-56

In the Background with reference to Fig. 4, Applicant describes a computing device (402) that includes a Remote NDIS miniport driver layer (414), and the computing device (402) is connected to a remote device (408) via a USB connection (*Background* p.6, lines 14-15; Fig. 4). The Examiner "interprets the computing device of Applicant's Background as the client device, and the remote device of Applicant's Background as the host device" (*Office Action* p.12). This interpretation is incorrect which leads to an incorrect conclusion that "a remote data communication interface driver of the host device implemented in the client device", as recited in claim 1, is described in the Background (*Office Action* p.12).

The Office's interpretation that the computing device of the Background is the client device, and that the remote device of the Background is the host device in Fig. 4 is incorrect because the Background is described with reference to Figs. 1-4, each of which include a computing device (e.g., host computing device) having communication components to communicate with client or remote devices via a communication link.

Fig.1 includes a host computing device (102) for conventional point-to-point communication with a client device (104) via a serial connection between serial ports of the two devices (*Background* p.3, lines 15-17). Similarly, Fig. 2 includes a host computing device (202) for point-to-point communication with a client device (204) via a point-to-point USB connection (*Background* p.3, lines 15-17).

Fig. 3 includes a computing device (302) having multipoint network data communication components for communication with network-connected device(s) via a LAN (310) (*Background* p.4, lines 12-14; p.6, lines 4-5). Fig. 4 includes the

computing device (402) having the Remote NDIS miniport driver layer (414) for communication with remote device (408) via a USB connection (*Background* p.6, lines 14-15; Fig. 4).

Accordingly, and contrary to the Office's interpretation, the computing device (402) in Fig. 4 is the host computing device and the remote device (408) is the client device. The Background describes that a host computing device can include a Remote NDIS miniport driver layer (414). The Detailed Description then describes the claimed subject matter which includes implementing a host computing device's Remote NDIS driver layer in an external device (e.g., a client, a remote device, a portable device, and the like) (*Specification* p.10, line 19 to p.11, line 7; p.14, lines 8-16).

Further, independent claims 1 and 32 are amended to clarify that the client device is a *remote* client device which includes a host computing device's Remote NDIS driver layer. For example, Fig. 5 illustrates a host computing device (502) and a remote client device (504) which includes the Remote NDIS miniport driver layer (530) of the host computing device (502) (*see Specification* p.14, lines 8-16 for examples of a remote client device). As described, an advantage to having remote devices implemented with a Remote NDIS miniport driver layer of a host computing device is that the host computing device does not need to then have the various and different driver(s) for the remote devices installed, but can still be communicatively linked with any number of the mobile client devices (*Specification* p.16, lines 6-12; Fig. 6).

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

Claims 1-14 and 32-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over the Background of Applicant's Specification (hereinafter, "Background") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,619 to Narisi et al. (hereinafter, "Narisi") (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

<u>Claim 1</u> recites a "data communication system configured to communicatively link a host device and a remote client device with a point-to-point data communication link, the host device and the remote client device each configured for multipoint data communication over a distributed network, the data communication system comprising a remote data communication interface driver of the host device implemented in the remote client device, the remote data communication interface driver configured to communicatively link with a data communication interface of the host device via the point-to-point data communication link"

Narisi and/or the Background do not teach or suggest "a remote data communication interface driver of the host device implemented in the remote client device", as recited in claim 1. Further, Narisi and/or the Background do not teach or suggest "the remote data communication interface driver configured to communicatively link with a data communication interface of the host device via the point-to-point data communication link", as recited in claim 1.

As described above with reference to the Office's Response to Arguments, Applicant's Background Fig. 4 only shows that a host computing device can include a Remote NDIS miniport driver layer. The remote device in Fig. 4 does

not include a remote data communication interface driver of the host device. Applicant's Fig.5 then illustrates the claimed subject matter which includes "a remote data communication interface driver of the host device implemented in the remote client device", as recited in claim 1 (*Specification* p.10, line 19 to p.11, line 7; p.14, lines 8-16).

Narisi does not teach or suggest any such configuration as recited in claim 1. Contrary to implementing a remote component of a host device in a remote client device, as recited in claim 1, the Office points out that the use of a virtual LAN in Narisi allows two devices to use their native mechanism to communicate with each other (*Office Action* p.3). Applicant's Background with reference to Fig. 3 essentially describes that a computing device has an NDIS layer to facilitate communication with network-connected device(s) via a LAN (*Background* p.4, line 19 to p. 6, line 5).

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the Background-Narisi combination for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-14 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1. Additionally, some or all of claims 2-14 may be allowable over the Background-Narisi combination for independent reasons.

Claim 32 recites a method for implementing a point-to-point data communication link between computing devices, the method comprising "implementing a remote network communication component of a host computing

device in a remote client computing device, the remote network communication component designed for data communication over a distributed network", and "implementing a connection interface to couple the remote network communication component with the host computing device".

As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Narisi and/or the Background do not teach or suggest "implementing a remote network communication component of a host computing device in a remote client computing device", as recited in claim 32. Further, Narisi does not teach or suggest any such configuration as recited in claim 32.

Accordingly, claim 32 is allowable over the Background-Narisi combination for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 33-44 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 32. Additionally, some or all of claims 33-44 may be allowable over the Background-Narisi combination for independent reasons.

lee⊗hayes   15   MS1-921US M01

Conclusion

Pending claims 1-14 and 32-44 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Nov. 29, 2005   By: _____
David A. Morasch
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 324-9256 x 210

16